



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/431,357	11/01/1999	PRASAD Y. CHEBROLU	2705-92	8571

7590 04/21/2004

MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM PC  
1030 SW MORRISON STREET  
PORTLAND, OR 97205

EXAMINER
----------

CALDWELL, ANDREW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

**Application**

09/431,357

**Applicant(s)**

CHEBROLU, PRASAD Y.

**Examiner**

Andrew Caldwell

**Art Unit**

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-9 and 11-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7, 13-15 and 17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 November 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

1  
2 **Remarks**

3 Claims 1-9 and 11-17 are pending.  
4

5 **Specification**

6 The abstract of the disclosure is objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.72(b) because (a)  
7 it does not describe the nature or gist of the claimed invention and (b) it is more than  
8 150 words in length. The abstract does not describe the feature added to claim 5 in the  
9 response filed on February 12, 2003 (i.e., the determining if existing calls are below a  
10 predetermined usage threshold and the subsequent migration of those calls to other  
11 network access servers). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).  
12

13 **Drawings**

14 The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show  
15 every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the following must be  
16 shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s): (a) an access server having  
17 associated channels carrying incoming digital or analog traffic; (b) the determining if  
18 existing calls are below a predetermined usage threshold and the subsequent migration  
19 of those calls to other network access servers. No new matter should be entered.

20 A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the  
21 Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings  
22 will not be held in abeyance.  
23

Art Unit: 2151

**Oath/Declaration**

This application presents a claim for subject matter not originally claimed or embraced in the statement of the invention. Neither the summary of the invention nor the originally filed claims mentioned: (a) the migration of existing calls to other network servers per claim 1; (b) a channel usage monitor determines if existing calls are below a predetermined usage threshold; (c) migrating to other network servers those existing calls below the usage threshold as determined by the channel usage monitor. A supplemental oath or declaration is required under 37 CFR 1.67. The new oath or declaration must properly identify the application of which it is to form a part, preferably by application number and filing date in the body of the oath or declaration. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,933,490, in view of Fratto, M., More than Throughput: Managed Modem Chassis, Network Computing, vol. 7, no. 17, pp. 1-5, Nov. 1996,

1 and further in view of Carson et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,629,832, and further in view of  
2 Service Provider Dial Scenarios and Configurations,  
3 [www.cisco.com/univercd/cc/td/doc/product/software/ios113ed/113ed/cr/dial\\_c/dcprt0](http://www.cisco.com/univercd/cc/td/doc/product/software/ios113ed/113ed/cr/dial_c/dcprt0)  
4 [/dcspex.pdf](http://www.cisco.com/univercd/cc/td/doc/product/software/ios113ed/113ed/cr/dial_c/dcprt0), pp. DC13 to DC56, January 1998, hereinafter "the Cisco Reference."  
5

6 Regarding claims 8 and 11, they are rejected for the reasons given in the last  
7 Office action. The newly added limitation to claim 8 creates, through its use of the  
8 word "may," a situation where the migration of existing calls is optional. Existing  
9 calls may be migrated to other access servers but they do not have to be migrated.  
10 The Applicant clearly knows how to write a claim where migration is required, since  
11 claims 1, 13, 16, and 17 all make the migration of existing calls mandatory. The  
12 examiner has therefore presumed that this difference in claim language is  
13 intentional. In stating reasons for the rejection for this claim, the examiner chooses  
14 to apply a combination directed to the option where existing calls are not migrated.  
15

16 Claims 1-4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable  
17 over White et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,933,490, in view of Fratto, M., More than  
18 Throughput: Managed Modem Chassis, Network Computing, vol. 7, no. 17, pp. 1-5,  
19 Nov. 1996, and further in view of Carson et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,629,832, and  
20 further in view of Service Provider Dial Scenarios and Configurations,  
21 [www.cisco.com/univercd/cc/td/doc/product/software/ios113ed/113ed/cr/dial\\_c/dcprt0](http://www.cisco.com/univercd/cc/td/doc/product/software/ios113ed/113ed/cr/dial_c/dcprt0)  
22 [/dcspex.pdf](http://www.cisco.com/univercd/cc/td/doc/product/software/ios113ed/113ed/cr/dial_c/dcprt0), pp. DC13 to DC56, January 1998, hereinafter "the Cisco Reference,"

1 and further in view of Hasler, J., Re: How to Establish a Semi-Permanent Dial-Up  
2 Connection?, lists.debian.org/debian-user/1998/debian-user-  
3 199812/msg03897.html, pp. 1-2, December 31, 1998.

4  
5 Regarding claim 1, the preamble will be given patentable weight since the claim  
6 body refers back to the preamble at line 6. See *the service request switch*. White  
7 teaches the invention substantially as claimed by disclosing an access server (Fig. 7  
8 elems. 96 & 98) having associated channels (Fig. 7 elem. 94) carrying incoming  
9 digital or analog traffic (col. 15 lines 15-16), the access server being operatively  
10 coupled with a service request switch (Fig. 7 elem. 54; Col. 15 lines 13-35).

11 White does not teach the method steps listed in lines 4-12 of claim 1.

12 Fratto on the other hand teaches an access server with the ability to busy out all  
13 modems (i.e., associated channels) of a server when a system manager manually  
14 initiates preventive maintenance (p. 3 5th complete paragraph). Fratto therefore  
15 teaches the method step of a system manager manually determining whether off-line  
16 maintenance is needed on a network access server and, if so, suggests the general  
17 idea of busying out the modems/channels prior to taking the access server offline for  
18 maintenance. Fratto also teaches that network access servers, prior to performing  
19 maintenance, disconnect, currently connected users (p. 2 disconnecting users prior  
20 to configuration upgrade).

21 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the  
22 invention was made to combine the teachings of Fratto with the access server of

1 White because of Fratto's teaching that this capability is a *basic* modem  
2 management function (p. 3 5th complete paragraph).

3 The combination of White in view of Fratto does not teach the specific steps of  
4 busying out the system, which are:

5 Communicating a busy condition of any unused associated channel from  
6 the network access server to the service request switch;

7 Monitoring any used associated channel for either of a digital and an  
8 analog call thereon and waiting until the used associated channel becomes  
9 substantially unused as indicated by defined digital and analog signaling  
10 protocols comprehended by such monitoring, and migrating any existing calls  
11 other network access servers;

12 When the unused associated channel becomes substantially unused as  
13 indicated by such defined digital and analog signaling protocols comprehended  
14 by said monitoring, communicating a busy condition of such then-unused  
15 channel from the network access server to the service request switch;

16 Signaling that maintenance on the network access server can be  
17 performed;

18 Automatically routing any new client service requests that may arrive  
19 during a busy condition of the network access server to another network access  
20 server operatively coupled with the service request switch.

21 Carson on the other hand teaches a method for busying out the channels of a  
22 network device (Col. 10 line 56 to Col. 11 line 24), comprising:

1           Communicating a busy condition of any unused associated channel from  
2           the network device to the service request switch (Col. 10 lines 57-61);

3           Monitoring any used associated channel for either of a digital and an  
4           analog call thereon and waiting until the used associated channel becomes  
5           substantially unused as indicated by defined digital and analog signaling  
6           protocols comprehended by such monitoring (Col. 11 lines 9-12; Fig. 5 loop  
7           between elem. 511 no path and elem. 520 no path shows the system looping or  
8           waiting until the CO line is idle);

9           When the unused associated channel becomes substantially unused as  
10          indicated by such defined digital and analog signaling protocols comprehended  
11          by said monitoring, communicating a busy condition of such then-unused  
12          channel from the network access server to the service request switch (Fig. 5  
13          elems. 510-513; Col. 10 line 56 to Col. 11 line 16);

14          Signaling that maintenance on the network device can be performed (Col.  
15          11 lines 12-16 audible alert).

16          It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the  
17          invention was made to modify the combination of White in view of Fratto by  
18          substituting Carson's specific teachings for busying out a network device for the  
19          combination's general teaching of busying out the network access server, thereby  
20          teaching the invention as claimed. This combination would have been obvious  
21          because of Carson's teaching that its method reduces interruptions to users of the  
22          system (Col. 1 lines 19-24).



1           The combination of White in view of Fratto and further in view of Carson does not  
2       teach a method wherein new client service requests that may arrive during a busy  
3       condition of the network access server are automatically routed to another network  
4       access server operatively coupled with the service request switch and migrating any  
5       existing calls other network access servers.

6           The Cisco reference on the other hand teaches a system wherein the channels  
7       of a hunt group are allocated across multiple access servers (p. DC-28 Fig. 13; pp.  
8       DC-45 to DC-46 describing the purpose of a hunt group).

9           It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the  
10      invention was made to spread the channels of the hunt group of the combination of  
11      White in view of Fratto and further in view of Carson as taught by the Cisco  
12      reference because doing so would increase the reliability of the system. In such a  
13      system, any new client service requests that may arrive during a busy condition of  
14      the network access server are automatically routed another network access server  
15      operatively coupled with the service request switch.

16          The combination of White in view of Fratto I and further in view of Carson and  
17      further in view of the Cisco Reference therefore teaches all features of the claimed  
18      invention except for the step of migrating any existing calls other network access  
19      servers.

20          As to the limitation of migrating any existing calls to other network access  
21      servers, the combination of White in view of Fratto and further in view of Carson and  
22      further in view of the Cisco Reference teaches that any connected users that are

1 currently connected will be disconnected prior to performing maintenance. See the  
2 discussion of Fratto above. So the combination of White in view of Fratto and further  
3 in view of Carson and further in view of the Cisco Reference teaches a method  
4 wherein connections that do not eventually terminate at the client/user's initiative are  
5 eventually disconnected.

6 Hasler on the other hand teaches a system for generating a semi-permanent dial  
7 up connection that will automatically dial up a user's ISP and reestablish the  
8 connection if the line goes down (pp. 1-2). Hasler therefore teaches that some users  
9 remain semi-permanently connected to their ISP.

10 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the  
11 invention was made to combine Hasler's teaching regarding a semi-permanent dial  
12 up connection with the client of White. This combination would have been obvious  
13 because it eliminates the user having to manually initiate the connection (Hasler p.  
14 1). In the resulting combination, the remote access server would terminate the semi-  
15 permanent connection when it initiates maintenance. The client would reestablish  
16 the semi-permanent dial up connection by dialing the hunt group, and the connection  
17 would be automatically routed to an available remote access server in the hunt  
18 group. The combination therefore teaches a method that migrates any existing calls  
19 other network access servers.

20 Regarding claim 2, the combination of White in view of Fratto and further in view  
21 of Carson and further in view of the Cisco Reference and further in view of Hasler  
22 teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See the rejection of claim 1 above.

1 The combination as applied to claim 1 above does not teach the additional step of  
2 claim 2. Carson on the other hand teaches a method, which after completion of the  
3 maintenance, further comprises communicating an idle condition of any associated  
4 channel to the service request switch (Col. 1 lines 51-54). It would have been  
5 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to  
6 combine Carson's teaching regarding returning the state of the channels to idle after  
7 completing maintenance with the method of the combination of White in view of  
8 Fratto and further in view of Carson and further in view of the Cisco Reference and  
9 further in view of Hasler because returning the channels to the idle state allows the  
10 network access server to receive calls again, and thereby perform its intended  
11 function.

12 Regarding claim 3, the combination of White in view of Fratto and further in view  
13 of Carson and further in view of the Cisco Reference and further in view of Hasler,  
14 as applied to claim 2 above, teaches the invention substantially as claimed. The  
15 combination of White in view of Fratto and further in view of Carson and further in  
16 view of the Cisco Reference and further in view of Hasler does not explicitly teach  
17 the additional limitation of claim 3. White does however teach that the central office  
18 switching system is connected to the access server via POTS or plain old telephone  
19 service connections (Col. 15 lines 13-16). Official notice is hereby taken of the fact  
20 that POTS connections use a standard signaling protocol to communicate the status  
21 of associated channels. White therefore teaches a system in which a standard  
22 communication protocol is used to communicate between the network access server

Art Unit: 2151

1 and the service request switch. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in  
2 the art at the time the invention was made to use the standard signaling protocol to  
3 communicate the busy/idle condition of any associated channel of the network  
4 access server to the switch because doing so increases the interoperability of the  
5 network access server, allowing it to be connected to the switches of different  
6 manufacturers.

7 Regarding claim 4, the combination of White in view of Fratto and further in view  
8 of Carson and further in view of the Cisco Reference and further in view of Hasler as  
9 applied to claim 1 above teaches a system in which both network access servers are  
10 in the same hunt group. See the discussion of the Cisco Reference above.

11 Regarding claims 16, it is a computer-readable medium claim corresponding to  
12 method claim 1. Since it does not teach or define above the information in the  
13 corresponding method claim, it is rejected under the same basis.

14  
15  
16 Claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
17 White in view of Fratto and further in view of Carson, and further in view of the Cisco  
18 Reference, and further in view of Fratto, M., Accessing the Enterprise: Large-Scale  
19 RAS to the Rescue, Network Computing, pp 1-8, April, 1999, hereinafter Fratto II, for  
20 the reasons given in the last Office action.

21  
22 ***Allowable Subject Matter***

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As to claim 5, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest a combination limited in which a channel usage monitor determines if existing calls are below a predetermined usage threshold and wherein existing calls below the usage threshold are migrated to other network servers. Fratto II on page 5 describes how the Shiva LanRover Access Switch handles firmware upgrades. Prior to initiating a firmware upgrade, the modems may be busied out. However, once the firmware upgrade process is initiated, all existing connections are dropped, regardless of whether a connection is currently being used. Nothing in Fratto II suggests that only existing calls below a usage threshold are migrated (i.e., their connections dropped so the user is forced to redial and access another access server in the hunt group). By not dropping calls above the usage threshold, a system according to the claimed invention distinguishes between connections where the user is lingering (i.e., remaining connected but not using the network) and those connections that are actively used. As shown in claims 13 and 17, they all contain a language directed to the same feature and are therefore allowed for the same reason. As to any claim not specifically discussed, it is allowed because it depends on one of the claims discussed above.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on February 12, 2004 (paper no. 13) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1           As to the rejection of claim 1, the Applicant is arguing in substance that the  
2 combination of White in view of Fratto I, Carson, and the Cisco Reference does not  
3 teach: (a) the step of monitoring of both analog and digital calls according to their  
4 respective protocols; (b) the step of automatically routing new calls to another network  
5 access server in the hunt group; (c) the step of migrating calls to other network access  
6 servers in order to busy out an active line with no interruption of service to the user.

7           As to point (a), claim 1 does not include the limitation of monitoring both analog  
8 and digital calls according to their respective protocols. The step of monitoring in claim  
9 1 cites digital and analog calls as alternatives, by its use of the word "either." Although  
10 the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification  
11 are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057  
12 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, the assignee's own product, the Cisco AS5200, teaches  
13 that a network access server accepting both analog and digital ISDN calls is known in  
14 the art (Cisco reference p. DC-18).

15           As to point (b), the Applicant argues that the combination does not teach the step  
16 of automatically routing new calls to another network access server in the hunt group.  
17 This argument about the meaning of a hunt group shown in Figure 13 on page DC-28  
18 ignores what the assignee's own reference teaches about the purpose of hunt groups.  
19 The Cisco Reference teaches that a hunt group number is the only number that clients  
20 dial into (p. DC-46). When a call is received, the telco switch searches for or hunts for  
21 the first available channel on any of the attached network access servers (p. DC-46 and  
22 Fig. 16 on p. DC-45). So in the combination of White in view of Fratto , Carson, and the

1 Cisco Reference, a network access server undergoing maintenance would have all lines  
2 busy, since they would either be connected to a user or busied out. The telco switch in  
3 the combination would therefore route the call to another access server in the hunt  
4 group in which one of the lines is not busy. The Applicant then argues that the  
5 combination could result in a situation where an incoming call is given a busy signal.  
6 While the examiner concedes that this situation could occur when all lines to all access  
7 servers in a hunt group are busy, the examiner argues that combination also teaches a  
8 combination in which all lines to all servers are not busy.

9 As to point (c), the Applicant is arguing a limitation that does not appear in the  
10 claim language. The claims say nothing about migrating a call *with no interruption of*  
11 *the service to the user*. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,  
12 limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988  
13 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

14 The Applicants also argues with respect to claim 1 that Carson teaches away  
15 from the claimed invention because it suggests that outside callers will receive a busy  
16 signal and try again later, as opposed to having their call directed to another server in a  
17 hunt group. This argument is not deemed persuasive. Carson is relied upon for its  
18 teachings regarding the details of busying out of telephone lines. Carson is not relied  
19 upon for any teachings regarding the distribution of calls across network access servers  
20 in a hunt group, since Carson addresses the problem of maintaining a *single* system.  
21 Since Fratto I explicitly teaches the busying out of telephone lines and Carson is relied

1 upon for teaching the details as to how this is carried out, the examiner concludes that  
2 Carson does not teach away.

3 As to independent claims 8 and 16, the Applicant's arguments are the same as  
4 those addressed above.

5 As to the rejection of claims 9 and 12, the Applicant is arguing in substance that  
6 the combination of White in view of Fratto I, Carson, the Cisco Reference, and Fratto II  
7 does not teach an automatic scheduler. See the Applicant's arguments at the bottom of  
8 page 12 of the response. The examiner disagrees with the Applicant's characterization  
9 of Fratto II. Fratto II use of the term scheduler suggests that it is a "thing." The  
10 examiner reasonably inferred that this thing referred to as a scheduler by Fratto II is  
11 known in the art. This conclusion is consistent with the Applicant's failure to disclose  
12 any details of a scheduler in this application. When viewed in this context, it is clear that  
13 Fratto II's statement suggests that one can either have personnel on hand to perform  
14 maintenance or have the scheduler perform the maintenance. If the scheduler performs  
15 the maintenance, it is without user intervention and therefore automatic.

16  
17 ***Conclusion***

18 A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **three**  
19 **months** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for  
20 response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C. 133, M.P.E.P.  
21 710.02, 710.02(b)).

22  
23 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
24 examiner should be directed to Andrew Caldwell, whose telephone number is (703)  
25 306-3036. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.  
26 EST.  
27



Art Unit: 2151

1 If attempts to reach the examiner by phone fail, the examiner's supervisor,  
2 Glenton Burgess, can be reached at (703) 305-4792. Additionally, the fax numbers for  
3 Group 2100 are as follows:

4  
5 Fax Responses: (703) 872-9306  
6

7 Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should  
8 be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-9600.  
9

10  
11   
12  
13  
14

15 Andrew Caldwell

16 703-306-3036

17 April 17, 2004

18